



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,712	12/10/2004	Roberto Dalla Valle	58009-019001	9144

7590 08/04/2009  
Pablo E Tapia  
Greenberg Traurig  
2450 Colorado Avenue  
Suite 400E  
Santa Monica, CA 90404

EXAMINER
----------

SAFAVI, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3637

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/04/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/517,712	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DALLA VALLE, ROBERTO	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL SAFAVI	<b>Art Unit</b> 3637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MICHAEL SAFAVI. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Daniel Wu. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 31 July 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
           c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
       If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: 10 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Baskin '030; Yukawa et al. '508; U.K. '296; Edwardes et al. '466.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Wu had stated Applicant's perceived differences between the method of the instant invention and that of the modifying references. Examiner had explained to Mr. Wu that any perceived differences should be set forth in a response to the final Office action along with arguments as to why the main prior art applied against the claims can not be modified under 35 U.S.C 103 by any of the secondary references and the applied tertiary reference.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michael Safavi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637	
---	--